Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-16 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7, 8, 14 and 16 being the independent claims. New claims 17-20 are added. Claims 4 and 11 are amended to increase their clarity, and not in response to a prior art rejection. Claims 7 and 16 are amended to increase their clarity and to more clearly recite their distinguishing features. The amendments introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10, 12-14 and 16 were rejected based on U.S. Patent 6,192,340 to Abecassis.

This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested based on the amendments above and the following analysis.

The assertions in the Official Action regarding the disclosure of Abecassis are respectfully traversed. The cited portions of Abecassis disclose manual or automated playlist functions. However, these functions appear to be in the multimedia device rather than being generated at the media server in response to user selection of clips, and then transmitted to a multimedia device to be parsed for file retrieval.

The pending independent claims (as amended) each recite that a playlist file is generated in a media server and transmitted to a multimedia device. In preferred embodiments recited in the dependent claims, the playlist uses a markup language such as XML.

The feature of generating a playlist data file at the server and transmitting it to the multimedia device facilitates a variety of advantages of the present invention,

particularly including the ability to deploy multimedia devices with extremely limited interfaces and computing power. As disclosed in the specification, these devices offer various choices to users through a display interface generated by a connected media server, such as an HTTP, WML or other browser-type interface. The user thus relies on the computing and menu generation power of the server to select the desired clips. Then, the server generates a playlist data file and transmits it to the multimedia device. The multimedia device uses file definition data in the playlist file to retrieve the desired clips in order from identified storage locations on the network.

The assertions in the Official Action regarding the dependent claims are also respectfully traversed, but will not be addressed in detail since these claims are patentable based on the features recited in the base claims, as well as their individual distinguishing features that are novel in the recited context.

Since the noted features and the resulting advantages are not disclosed or suggested by Abecassis, reconsideration of the rejection is appropriate.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11 and 15 were rejected as obvious based on the combination of Abecassis and U.S. Patent 6,256,623 to Jones.

This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks.

Initially, Jones does not teach or suggest the playlist feature discussed above with respect to the rejection based on Abecassis. Therefore, the combination of Jones and Abecassis does not remedy the deficiencies of Abecassis in this regard. The combination of Jones and Abecassis does not make out a prima facie case of obviousness with regard

to independent claims 8 and 14, and therefore dependent claims 11 and 15 are patentable over these references.

Further, dependent claims 11 and 15 particularly recite the use of XML format for the playlist transmitted by a media server to the multimedia device. Jones merely discloses the use of XML in an Internet environment. Applicant does not claim to have invented XML; rather, applicant has found that the use of XML offers particular advantages in the claimed context, for the particular purpose of transmitting a playlist to a multimedia device. This use of XML is not suggested by either of the references cited in this rejection. Nor is there any specific motivation in either of these references to generate and transmit a playlist in XML format at a media server and transmit it to a multimedia device for use by that device in retrieving clips. Therefore, these references do not make out a prima facie case of obviousness as to claims 11 and 15.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Evan R. Smith
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,683

Date: 9/7/04

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

272252_1.DOC